

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 2, 9-11 and 14 have been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from the referenced prior art. In addition, dependent claims 3, 4, 6-8, 16 and 17 have been amended. Further, new claims 18-23 have been added.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al.(E.P. Patent No.0991007) in view of Borge (US 2005/0059483). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-23 for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a first game execution apparatus that reads, from a first game recording medium, first permission information indicating which attribute from a plurality of attributes of a common character is permitted to be changed by the first game execution apparatus, and recites a second game execution apparatus that reads from, a second game recording medium, second permission information indicating which attribute is permitted to be changed by the second game execution apparatus. In addition, claim 1 recites that, in accordance with the read first/second permission information, the first/second game execution unit changes the attribute permitted to be changed by the first/second game execution apparatus

as the game proceeds, and prohibits an attribute not permitted to be changed by the first/second game execution apparatus from being changed.

Finally, claim 1 recites that the first/second permission information is associated with the attributes of the common character, wherein the common character commonly appears in the game by the first/second game execution unit, and wherein the first permission information differs from the second permission information.

In summary, claim 1 requires that permitting or prohibiting the changing of characteristics of characters is determined based on permission information included in each game execution apparatus, such that the first permission information differs from the second permission information.

The above-identified rejection relies on Borge for teaching the above-described first/second permission information, as recited in claim 1. However, Borge teaches unlocking game characteristics of characters such as traits, weapons, weaknesses, etc., such that once an unlocked characteristic of a character is unlocked and saved in a storage medium, a player can go to another game execution apparatus and load the unlocked characteristics of the character (see paragraph [0027] and the last paragraph of page 5 of the Office Action issued April 24, 2009).

Thus, in view of the above, it is apparent that Borge teaches that once an unlocked characteristic of a character is unlocked and saved, the player can load the unlocked characteristics onto another game execution apparatus, but still fails to disclose or suggest that the first/second permission information are associated with the attributes of the common character, wherein the common character commonly appears in the game by the first/second

game execution unit, and wherein the first permission information differs from the second permission information, as required by claim 1.

In other words, Borge requires that the player can load the same unlocked characteristics onto another game execution apparatus, but fails to disclose or suggest that permitting or prohibiting the changing of characteristics of characters is determined based on permission information included in each game execution apparatus, such that the first permission information differs from the second permission information, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Miyamoto and Borge.

Amended independent claims 2, 9, 10, 11 and 14 are directed to an apparatus, a medium, a method, a program, and a medium, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 2, 9, 10, 11 and 14 and claims 3, 4, 6-8, 12, 13 and 16-23 that depend therefrom are allowable over any combination of Miyamoto and Borge.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuichi FUTA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.08.24 15:45:33 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 24, 2009